# CASE NEG – Military Schools

## 1

#### A] Interpretation: aff must defend that all public colleges and universities in the United states ought not restrict protected speech

#### “in” means “throughout”

Words and Phrases 08 Volume 28, p. 204-215

—Reynolds v. Larkins, 14 P. 114, 10 Colo. 126 Colo. 1887. In the act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, etc., the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout” such counties.

#### “public colleges and universities” is a bare plural without an article – means all.

Byrd Pat, department of applied linguistics & ESL. “Generic Meaning” Georgia State University. Transcript of one of Byrd’s lectures.

Douglas Biber and Susan Conrad, two of the authors of the Longman Grammar, have written about what they call "seemingly synonymous words." They have shown how the adjectives big, great, and large are used differently in academic writing from in fiction. Their point is that when a language has forms that seem to be synonyms--the forms are likely to be used in different ways in different settings. One can't just be substituted for another without a change in meaning or a violation of style. A big toe isn't the same as a large toe. And I don't think I know what a great toe might be. Or, for another example, a political scientist would call Georgia a large state but not necessarily a great state. But a politician from Georgia is likely to talk about the great State of Georgia.¶ A similar process is at work with the use of these generic forms in context. We have a set of sentences that seem to have very much the same meaning. It is probable that the uses of these forms do not entirely overlap. However, we do not yet have a complete picture of how generic forms are used. But the use of computers for linguistic research is a new field, and we get more information all the time. ¶ Here are some things that we do know about these generic noun phrase types when they are used in context:¶ 1. The + singular: The computer has changed modern life. ¶ This form is considered more formal than the others--and is not as likely to be used in conversation as the plural noun: Computers have changed modern life. ¶ Master (1987) found in the sample that he analyzed that this form with the was often used to introduce at topic--and came at the beginning of a paragraph and in introductions and conclusions.¶ 2. Zero + plural: Computers are machines. Computers have changed modern life. ¶ Probably the most common form for a generalization. It can be used in all contexts--including both conversation (Basketball players make too much money) and academic writing (Organisms as diverse as humans and squid share many biological processes). ¶ Perhaps used more in the hard sciences and social sciences than in the humanities. ¶ 3. A + singular: A computer is a machine. ¶ This generic structure is used to refer to individual instances of a whole group and is used to classify whatever is being discussed.¶ The form is often used for definitions of terms. ¶ It is also often used to explain occupations. My sister is a newspaper reporter. I am a teacher. ¶ Use is limited to these "classifying" contexts. Notice that this form can't always be subtituted for the other: \*Life has been changed by a computer. \*A computer has changed modern life. ¶ 4. Zero + noncount: Life has been changed by the computer. ¶ The most basic meaning and use of noncount nouns is generic--they are fundamentally about a very abstract level of meaning. Thus, the most common use of noncount nouns is this use with no article for generic meaning. ¶ Zero Article and Generic Meaning¶ Most nouns without articles have generic meaning. Two types are involved.¶ 1. Zero + plural: Computers are machines. Computers have changed modern life.¶ 2. Zero + noncount: Life has been changed by the computer.

#### B] Violation: they only defend some colleges in the United States

#### C] Net Benefits:

#### 1. limits

They can specify any permutation of colleges, which explodes limits and creates an untenable case list, which kills education because we can’t prep effectively if we’re spread out so thin – education is a voter because it’s the only out of round benefit and is why we debate in the first place. Limits also is an independent voter and outweighs.

Harris 13 Scott, Director of Debate at U Kansas, 2006 National Debate Coach of the Year, Vice President of the American Forensic Association, 2nd speaker at the NDT in 1981. “This ballot.” 5 April 2013. CEDA Forums. http://www.cedadebate.org/forum/index.php?action=dlattach;topic=4762.0;attach=1655

I understand that there has been some criticism of Northwestern’s strategy in this debate round. This criticism is premised on the idea that they ran framework instead of engaging Emporia’s argument about home and the Wiz. I think this criticism is unfair. Northwestern’s framework argument did engage Emporia’s argument. Emporia said that you should vote for the team that performatively and methodologically made debate a home. Northwestern’s argument directly clashed with that contention. My problem in this debate was with aspects of the execution of the argument rather than with the strategy itself. It has always made me angry in debates when people have treated topicality as if it were a less important argument than other arguments in debate. Topicality is a real argument. It is a researched strategy. It is an argument that challenges many affirmatives. The fact that other arguments could be run in a debate or are run in a debate does not make topicality somehow a less important argument. In reality, for many of you that go on to law school you will spend much of your life running topicality arguments because you will find that words in the law matter. The rest of us will experience the ways that word choices matter in contracts, in leases, in writing laws and in many aspects of our lives. Kansas ran an affirmative a few years ago about how the location of a comma in a law led a couple of districts to misinterpret the law into allowing individuals to be incarcerated in jail for two days without having any formal charges filed against them. For those individuals the location of the comma in the law had major consequences. Debates about words are not insignificant. Debates about what kinds of arguments we should or should not be making in debates are not insignificant either. **The limits debate** is an argument that **has real pragmatic consequences**. I found myself earlier this year judging Harvard’s eco-pedagogy aff and thought to myself—I could stay up tonight and put a strategy together on eco-pedagogy, but then I thought to myself—why should I have to? Yes, I could put together a strategy against any random argument somebody makes employing an energy metaphor but the reality is there are only so many nights to stay up all night researching. **I would like to** actually **spend time playing catch** with my children occasionally **or** maybe even **read a book or go to a movie** or spend some time with my wife. **A world where there are an infinite number of affirmatives is a world where the demand to have a specific strategy** and not run framework **is a world that says this community doesn’t care whether its participants** have a life or do well in school or spend time with their families. I know there is a new call abounding for interpreting this NDT as a mandate for broader more diverse topics. The reality is that will create more work to prepare for the teams that choose to debate the topic but will have little to no effect on the teams that refuse to debate the topic. Broader topics that do not require positive government action or are bidirectional will not make teams that won’t debate the topic choose to debate the topic. I think that is a con job. I am not opposed to broader topics necessarily. I tend to like the way high school topics are written more than the way college topics are written. I just think people who take the meaning of the outcome of this NDT as proof that we need to make it so people get **to talk about anything** they want to talk about without having to debate against Topicality or framework arguments are interested in constructing a world that **might make debate an unending nightmare** and not a very good home in which to live. Limits, to me, are a real impact because I feel their impact in my everyday existence.

#### 2. precision

It controls the internal link to engagement because the resolution is how we base research and argumentation – their arguments can’t provide educational if they’re not based in the resolution, otherwise no one is prepared to debate them. Independently, topicality rule is a prior question –

Nebel 15 Jake, debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC. “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/ SA-IB

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the a**ffirmative **must defend the r**esolution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see what is distinctive about topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: it **would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the** resolution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, we ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic** considerations for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.

Topical version of the aff – defend all colleges and read a militarism advantage – people will engage it OR defend that all colleges not restrict speech that criticizes the military, like PCDS PW’s aff

#### D] Drop the debater –

#### No RVIs

1. neg flex – having multiple 2NR outs is key against plans like theirs

2. kills all education because it forces every debate to be decided on theory which means that we are never able to attempt to check abusive practices without every speech being all theory

3. counter-interp: they get an RVI on theory, which solves their offense, topicality is a predictable argument that they should have to beat along with substantive objections to the aff

4. counter-interp: they get an RVI if I read X or more shells – solves enough of their offense and supercharges my arguments

5. no rvi forces the aff to become more efficient at defending their position from a multiplicity of attacks which makes them better debaters and better advocates

## 2

#### Public collegiate military schools ought to only restrict constitutionally protected speech in order to prohibit the nonconsensual distribution of sexually explicit images.

#### It competes – court decisions flow neg.

Humbach 14 John, professor at Pace University, practiced corporate/securities law for five years on Wall Street before entering law teaching in 1971. Most of his teaching experience before coming to Pace in 1977 was at Fordham Law School, but he also taught at Brooklyn Law School and as a visiting professor at the University of Illinois and the University of Hawaii. He has authored a number of articles in the areas of property law and professional responsibility, as well as computer-assisted instruction programs for first-year property students. “The Constitution and Revenge Porn” Pace University School of Law. Pace Law Review, Volume 35, Issue 1, Fall 2014. SA-IB

Unfortunately, these two key prohibitions of [nonconsensual sexually explicit image distribution] revenge porn laws seem to fly directly in the face of the free speech and press guarantees of the First Amendment.10 In short, the two prohibitions constitute unconstitutional content discrimination, viewpoint discrimination and speaker discrimination, not to mention prior restraint. A restriction on speech that is limited to particular content, e.g., sexual exposure, is content discrimination.11 A restriction designed to suppress a particular point of view, e.g., negative or unflattering personal information, is viewpoint discrimination.12 And a restriction that is applicable only to persons who have not received consent is speaker discrimination,13 as well as a prior restraint—among the most disfavored of restrictions on speech.14 While the Supreme Court has recognized a number of circumstances that justify government impingements on free expression, the Court has been extremely reluctant to permit speech restrictions that discriminate based on a message’s content, its viewpoint, or the speaker.15 It has nearly always refused to tolerate such discrimination unless the case falls within one of the several historically established exceptions to First Amendment protection.16 Because of the special place that the modern First Amendment cases accord to content discrimination (and the allied discriminations based on viewpoint and speaker), any statutes designed specifically to outlaw revenge porn as such17 would seem to face some very tough sledding—if indeed they can be written in ways that are constitutionally permissible at all.

#### Nonconsensual sexually explicit image distribution causes psychological violence and suicide – it destroys people’s futures.

Abdul-Alim 16 Jamaal, a freelance journalist and a Washington correspondent for Diverse Issues in Higher Education. His articles have appeared in Education Week, Washington Monthly, and U.S. News & World Report. Abdul-Alim plans to explore the impact of various efforts to hold teacher preparation programs more accountable for student achievement. “Colleges may get Help Fighting ‘Revenge Porn’” October 03, 2016. Diverse, Issues in Higher Education. <http://diverseeducation.com/article/87594/> SA-IB

Similar things have happened at colleges and universities in recent years.For example, Tyler Clementi, an 18-year-old Rutgers University freshman, leapt to his death after a roommate used a webcam to live broadcast Clementi on social media having sex in his dorm with another man. The roommate, Dharun Ravi, served 20 days in jail on various charges and was ordered to pay $10,000 to a program to help victims of hate crimes. However, his conviction was overturned last month due to a change in state law. Last year, Penn State banned Kappa Delta Rho fraternity for three years after it surfaced that members of the fraternity had been using an invitation-only Facebook page to post photos of nude women who were passed out. Congresswoman Speier said the Internet has become a “new age sewage pipeline carrying the worst material imaginable in endless quantities.” “As social media proliferates, so do the opportunities to destroy people’s lives,” Speier said at Friday’s discussion on The Hill. “Young people are committing suicide because of their images being distributed without their consent.” While the majority of states have passed various types of anti-revenge porn laws, Speier said the “patchwork” of state laws — some of which only target those who are motivated by a desire to harass the victim — creates great uncertainty for victims. “If passed, this bill will punish individuals and websites that knowingly post private, intimate materials while also providing a safe harbor for websites that don’t advertise or solicit such content,” Speier said. Speier said her proposed revenge porn law has been reviewed by 12 constitutional scholars who have all refuted concerns that the law would violate free speech. Among the scholars who back the bill are University of Miami law professor Mary Anne Franks. “A federal criminal law is necessary not only to provide a single, clear articulation of the relevant elements of the crime, but also to signal society’s acknowledgement and condemnation of this serious wrongdoing,” Franks, who helped draft the bill, has [written](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mary-anne-franks/how-to-defeat-revenge-porn_b_7624900.html). Under the bill, perpetrators who post images of a person who is naked or engaged in sex could be fined or imprisoned for up to five years if they did so without the person’s consent. Carrie Goldberg, a Brooklyn-based attorney who represents victims of revenge porn, said 90 percent of the victims are women and range in age from 13 to 65. She said having one’s naked images published online can do irreparable harm. “At this point in time no one can get a job, date or even a roommate without being Googled,” Goldberg said. “How would you feel if the first five pages of your results were images of you fully exposed and images you never wanted anyone to see?” Goldberg said revenge porn on campus is becoming more common and said her firm is handling one such case but that she could not disclose the particulars. She criticized authorities who handled the Penn State case because although Pennsylvania has a revenge porn law, it was not applied against the Kappa Delta Rho fraternity because of apparent lack of intent.

#### \*\*\*Some of the following evidence frames abuse in between women and men only – I reject that assumption, but the cards discuss specific examples which involved men and women\*\*\*

#### West Point is famous for filming people in showers.

Szoldra 3/9 Paul, left the Marines and is now a journalist at Business Insider and is the editor of the Defense vertical.

In a thread dedicated to the US Military Academy at West Point, some users who appeared to be cadets shared photos and graduation years of their female classmates. "What about the basketball locker room pics, I know someone has those," one user said, apparently referring to photos taken surreptitiously in a women's locker room. "I always wondered whether those made it out of the academy computer system," another user responded. In 2012, an Army sergeant who helped train and mentor cadets was discovered to have secretly filmed more than a dozen women [in the bathroom and shower areas](http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2013/05/22/army-sergeant-accused-of-videotaping-female-cadets-at-west-point/) at West Point. The soldier [pleaded guilty in the case](https://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/07/us/west-point-sergeant-pleads-guilty-to-secretly-videotaping-female-cadets.html) and was sentenced in 2014 to 33 months in prison. "Bumping all 3 service academies' threads to see who can post the best wins in the next 7 days. Winning school gets the [commander's cup]," one user wrote. "Go Army, Beat Everyone." Lt. Col. Christopher Kasker, a spokesman for the US Military Academy, told Business Insider: "The content on this image board or other websites, attributed to both West Point graduates and our fellow service members, is both alarming and contrary to our values. When alerted to incidents such as this, we thoroughly investigate and take appropriate action."

#### Militarism reproduces patriarchy and gendered violence – CP controls the internal link to the 1AC’s criticism of culture.

White 07 Aaronette, professor social psych at UC Santa Cruz. "All the Men Are Fighting for Freedom, All the Women Are Mourning Their Men, but Some of Us Carried Guns: A Raced‐Gendered Analysis of Fanon’s Psychological Perspectives on War" Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society. 2007

As social institutions, **military forces are not gender neutral**. The ideology of **militarism** interacts with discrete forms of military organizations to **produce gender identities consonant with patriarchal ideology and practices** (Cock 1991; de Waal 2002; Enloe 2004b). **Militarist and patriarchal ideologies** and practices often **work against democratic values associated with revolutionary transformation**. Thus nationalist parties engaged in armed struggle often end up “shooting democracy in the foot” (Mama 2000). **The patriarchal nature of war, militarism, and military training combined to perpetuate violent injustices and entrench colonized mentalities** that Fanon predicted revolutionary violence would eradicate (Mama 2000; de Waal 2002; Campbell 2003). The **patriarchal mentality of many African men nurtured under colonial rule was reinforced during independence struggles** as nationalist consciousness became militarized through values imparted by involvement with the armed forces (Cock 1991; de Waal 2002; Enloe 2004b). **Authoritarianism** **and** the notion of **combat** as men’s work **promoted narrow, hypermasculine views of manhood** (e.g., **manhood as aggressive, competitive, stoic, and the opposite of anything feminine**). Revolutionary war also produced sexual divisions of labor that worked against the equal recognition of women by men in military forces. As an ideology, militarism construes violence in terms of various masculine ideals—courage, virility, chivalry, and superiority (Mama 2000; de Waal 2002; Enloe 2004b). Authoritarianism, deemed essential to military organization, construes power in terms of absolute authority, hierarchy, and obedience (de Waal 2002). By privileging hierarchy and rule by command, authoritarianism works against democratic values such as free expression, consensus, egalitarianism, and transparency in decision making (de Waal 2002). Authoritarian values are important to military organizations because war is strategic, aimed at gaining and exercising power. **Combat is the manifestation of power in its most brutal and uncompromising form** (de Waal 2002). **Authoritarianism molds a soldier who will obey orders without thinking and will internalize unquestioning loyalty** to his superiors in ways that minimize the chance that he will flinch in combat (Grossman 1995; de Waal 2002). However, **by fostering blind compliance military values work against the autonomy of soldiers**, regardless of gender, **complicating** any sense of **agency** that Fanon claimed combat would restore. This ~~blind~~ **compliance works against women’s sense of agency**, in particular, because prewar **gender inequalities are exacerbated by a predominantly male military leadership more prone to abuse its power** during the war given the subordinate status of most female soldiers combined with the stress of life in the camps. In addition to the authoritarianism that pervades the military as a social institution, **the stereotype of the supermacho combat soldier perpetuates hypermasculine attitudes and values that also work against a male soldier’s recognition of a woman soldier** (or any woman) as his equal. South African feminist sociologist Jacklyn Cock elaborates: “War does not challenge women to prove that they are women, whereas wars have been historically symbolized as the touchstone of ‘manliness.’ The concept of war as a proving ground of manliness has centered on the notion of combat, which is understood to be the ultimate test of masculinity, and thus crucial to the ideological structure of patriarchy” (1991, 235–36). The guerrilla warfare tactics used in most of Africa’s revolutionary wars did not rely on hand‐to‐hand combat. They often relied on ambushing patrols, sabotaging communication and transportation lines, and making hit‐and‐run attacks against enemy posts—tasks women are fully capable of carrying out (Goldman 1982; Cock 1991; Goldstein 2001). Yet the myth of combat as men’s work dies hard; even with today’s technologically sophisticated war weaponry, the “presumption that a man is unproven in his manhood until he has engaged in collective, violent, and physical struggle against someone categorized as the enemy” is widespread (Enloe 1983, 13). Indeed, Fanon’s arguments concerning the transformative potential of war resonate with such masculinist overtones. Masculinist notions also serve as powerful tools for making men into soldiers because military forces encourage aggressiveness and competitiveness while censuring emotional expression and denouncing physically weak soldiers as effeminate (Enloe 1983; Cock 1991; Goldstein 2001). Combat readiness, male bonding, and social cohesion are achieved through military training **by emphasizing the otherness of** both women and **the enemy**: women represent the weaker sex, home and hearth, and the need to be protected, while the enemy represents the weaker force to be dominated and conquered (Enloe 1983; Cock 1991; Goldstein 2001). **Given the interactive relationship among militarism, military forces as social institutions, and combat as the test of a man’s masculinity, it is not surprising that women have been excluded** from most combat, whether in conventional or guerrilla armies (Goldman 1982; Cock 1991; Goldstein 2001).11

#### Militarism fosters rape culture which necessitates action to prevent harassment

Ryan 3/10 Erin, senior editor at the Daily Beast. “Nude Photo Scandal Is ‘No Surprise’ to These Female Troops” March 10, 2017. http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2017/03/11/nude-photo-scandal-is-no-surprise-to-these-female-troops.html SA-IB

This week, news broke that men in the Marine Corps used online forums to swap thousands of photos of nude female service members without the women’s knowledge or consent. As the scandal radiates outward to other branches of the military, it now appears that the grey market for nude photos of servicewomen could be an epidemic-level problem in the military. To the public, a story of this magnitude—one photo-sharing forum called Marines United boasted 30,000 members—is shocking. To many women who have recently served in the American armed forces, it’s anything but. “This scandal doesn’t surprise me at all,” retired Marine Corps Sergeant Tanya Sciorilli tells The Daily Beast. She adds that she’d heard rumors that Google Drive had been circulating for nearly a year, and that people had been working to have it taken down and reported. “It also doesn’t surprise me that no legal action was taken until the information was given to the general public,” she adds. “It seems like they’re trying to save face. A day late and a dollar short.” The photo-sharing rings, uncovered by Reveal, Business Insider, and the BBC, now involve tens of thousands of soldiers across multiple branches of the military. Participants in the rings would post clothed photos of women, often lifted from their social media accounts, and request more provocative ones from members of the forum that may have had intimate contact with them. A nude photo was called a “win.” One woman in Business Insider’s account tried unsuccessfully to shake her harassers by changing the privacy settings of her social media. “Can’t lie, it’s no surprise,” an Army vet we’re calling Jenny tells The Daily Beast. What’s happening now is simply the next step in the evolution of a practice that’s been widespread among service members she’s known in recent years. During Jenny’s time on active duty, she says she witnessed similar behavior from fellow soldiers, only instead of organizing their photo sharing on internet forums, they’d pass along nudes via group texts. Or they’d simply show other soldiers their cache of private photos directly from their computers. She recalls walking into rooms to find soldiers gathered around a computer watching videos of sexual encounters, sometimes of group sex, sometimes videos that seemed to be filmed without the awareness of the film’s female subjects. Some of the women were fellow service members, Jenny says, but others were not. Supervisors, she says, would be aware of the non-consensual photo and video-sharing but turn a blind eye to avoid stirring up trouble. “In some situations, different groups on a post would have a rating system and compare notes on potential fucks,” Jenny says. “Rating on looks, how easy to fuck. Does she play games? Possible downfalls like: Does she work directly for a powerful person who could affect your career? Is she married?” Jenny says some servicewomen willingly shared their photos with the expectation that they’d be passed around. But many did not. “The sad part is the ones who really like someone and don’t realize that a whole group of men are reading everything she texts to a dude and or looking at her photos. Kinda like having a relationship with a whole unit.” A Navy veteran we’re calling Leah says that there was an expectation that sexy photos would be shared. It’s baked into her understanding of how communication works in the modern American military. “From personal experience, and this definitely doesn’t need to be specifically related to me, but back in the day if you were going to do stupid shit like [share nude photos], you made sure your head wasn’t in the pic, so it couldn’t come back and bite you,” she says. None of the women who spoke to The Daily Beast blamed the women for what happened, but they did note that because the practice of sharing images with other men was so common, they’d avoided sending intimate photos themselves. Amanda Burrill, another Navy veteran, adds, “It’s abhorrent, but women need to not make nude photos available to these animals. This probably happens at every single command.” “I would never send a pic to a dude,” says Jenny. “ A dude can use it as backlash or blackmail if you don’t keep him happy.” Capt. Justine Elena, a Marine who served in Afghanistan and is currently serving in the reserves, says “just don’t take nudes” isn’t as simple a prescription to this problem as it may seem. Service members who are deployed are often separated from their boyfriends and girlfriends for long periods of time, and swap photos as a way to maintain a feeling of intimacy. Further, among women in the service, sometimes part of fitting in means being complacent or silent when you see your male colleagues carry out behaviors you feel are wrong, like sharing photos or using explicit or harmful language toward another female servicemember. It’s like being a little sister,” Elena says. “You want to hang out with your big brother and all of his friends. You can’t forget who you are, but you want so badly to be in line with them on a social level. You know you have what it takes to be a Marine. But do you have what it takes to hang?” It’s not like the problem begins and ends with photo sharing. Truth is, it’s not much of a logical leap to tie the cesspool of Marines United and similar message boards to other problems the American military has faced in recent years. Even after a troubling 2011 report found that women in the military were more likely to be raped by a fellow service member than killed in combat, even after another report found that 80 percent of women in the military experienced sexual harassment, even after all the Senate panels and photo ops and tribunals and very serious discussions about the seriousness of this very serious issue, it seems some male members of the military still aren’t taking sexual harassment seriously. “I remember being called in and showed some porn and someone asked me if it was me!” recalls Amanda Burrill. “I was on an all-male ship. It was very uncomfortable. I mean, it got much worse than that!” Burrill says she was kissed against her will, and that unwanted sexual advances were common. She used to run on the ship’s old treadmill every day. (That was the best way to avoid unwanted approaches.) Once, her fellow sailors broke into her room and ejaculated all over her belongings, including her running shoes.

#### **Their failure to analyze the intersection between hegemonic masculinity and militarism actively propagates patriarchal domination and turns case – vote neg to engage in a gender-conscious analysis.**

WRI 10 War Resisters International “Militarization and masculinities,” 3/1, http://www.wri-irg.org/node/9725

Refusing militarism is not possible without refusing hegemonic masculinity Andreas Speck, War Resisters' International “Questioning the militarist value system and its practices which are identified with military service, one is also obliged to question the hegemonic understanding of masculinity. In Turkey, military service is a laboratory in which masculinity is reproduced. The patriarchal system is solidified through military service. I objected to military service, because I am also against this laboratory manufactured masculinity. The struggle against militarism defined in heterosexist terms through sexist structures finds its fundamental expression in anti-militarism. This refers to freedom of sexual orientation, gender equality and total and unrestricted freedom”.1 Halil Savda, Turkish conscientious objector, repeatedly imprisoned for his conscientious objection to military service I can easily relate to what Halil Savda writes above. When I was about 13 or 14 – and the army still a long way ahead – I was quite fascinated with technology, as many young boys are. I even remember during one holiday going to a Navy open day, looking at the different Navy ships, helicopters, etc... I could be fascinated by this technology, but I didn't think much about myself in a uniform, and being part of the Navy. At that time these two things were quite separate issues. Once I got a bit older, the reality of having to serve in the military got closer. And increasingly I could not see myself running around in a uniform, being shouted at, and being part of an all-male and very macho environment. I was at that time in an almost all-male environment doing my apprenticeship as an electrician, and could never relate to the sexist talk and macho posture. Not that I was consciously much of an anti-sexist at that time, but I just could not relate to it. This was just for eight hours a day, five days a week, but thinking about something like this 24/7, without any space to escape, felt more like horror to me. I wasn't aware of being gay at that time, but had already experienced quite a bit of peer harassment for not taking part in dirty sexist talks, and other macho posture, in my last years at school. Again, military service just felt like exponentially worse. So, when the time came, I opted for conscientious objection. Of course, there were also political reasons for the objection, but I think on a different level my deeply felt aversion against this masculine environment might have been more important at that time. My unwillingness to serve was deeply connected to the images of masculinity linked with the military, which I felt very uncomfortable with.2 Militarism and masculinities – the links Jeff Hearn writes: “**It is an understatement to say that men, militarism, and the military are historically, profoundly, and blatantly interconnected**” (Hearn 2003). But he also points out: “**The exact nature of the connections between men and the military are themselves various and plural – thus there are military masculinities, and not just military masculinity**” (emphasis in original).3 And Raewyn Connell adds: “**There are many causes of violence, including dispossession, poverty, greed, nationalism, racism, and other forms of inequality, bigotry and desire. Gender dynamics are by no means the whole story. Yet given the concentration of weapons and the practices of violence among men, gender patterns appear to be strategic. Masculinities are the forms in which many dynamics of violence take shape**”.4 For men, especially in countries with compulsory military service, serving in the military is an important part of “becoming a man”. As Turkish gay conscientious objector Mehmet Tarhan puts it: “Military service creates a definition of normality for itself through the exclusion of women, gays, disabled persons and children and generalizes this definition to the rest of the society. The heterosexual man becomes the norm that the regime prefers and identifies with. The rest are considered as either surplus/excess or property to be protected”.5 **This link between militarism, violence, and masculinity is not at all “natural” – it had to be constructed, and what has been constructed can also be undone. In fact, it is historically a quite recent development**. Joanne Nagel shows that for the United States the connection between militarised forms of masculinity – the ideal of soldiering – goes back to the late 19th and early 20th century.6 In Germany, this process happened in the early 19th century – German bourgeois masculinity, which was not convinced of military service, had to be reshaped and militarised. At that time, as Ute Frevert points out, “the male gender character more and more incorporated soldier-like elements. Military values and assumptions about order ... thus more and more became the general ideal for the male nation”.7 Similar arguments can be made for the construction of Jewish masculinities through the Zionist project. Research on why young men perform military service points to a very close link with masculinity. Hanne-Margret Birckenbach, a German peace researcher, did some extensive research, involving a range of interviews, on the subject of “willingness to serve among youths”.8 To put this research into context: Germany is a country with obligatory military service, where the right to conscientious objection is recognised but conditioned upon performing substitute civilian service. In her conclusions, she writes: “Those willing to serve expect that military service would help them to become adult men. Serving in the military is connected to the expectation that this provides masculinity and with it the right and power to play a natural dominant role. However, the image of masculinity of these youth is in no way directed towards proving themselves in military combat, but rather towards meeting challenges in everyday civilian life, especially in the field of employment” (Ibid, p. 230). In short: "**Under the guise of ‘no to killing vs. yes to killing for the purpose of defence’ conscientious objectors and those willing to perform military service argue not only about military violence, but also – without being aware of this – about ideals of masculinity**”.9 Ayşe Gül Altinay comes to similar conclusions in relation to Turkey. She quotes a young man, Ibrahim, as saying: “You do not become a man until you serve in the military. It is a sacred obligation. And people make fun of those who have not served. I, for one, did it just because I would feel a lack without it. I am flat-footed. If I had wanted, I could have been excused from military service. But I did not want to be excused. So I did it”.10 Altinay concludes, very much like Birckenbach did in the German context 20 years earlier: “In this context, military service is not only, or perhaps not even primarily, seen as a service to the state, but one that defines proper masculinity. It is a rite of passage to manhood”. Women and masculinities “As a woman, I am a consumer of masculinities, but I am not more so than men are; and, like men, I as a woman am also a producer of masculinities and a performer of them”,11 writes E.K. Sedgwick. A quote from an Israeli woman makes this very clear: “I know that I prefer men who are combat soldiers to others who are just jobniks”.12 This was also true for Germany in the 1980s, where girls generally preferred boys who had done their military service.13 Thus, through women's expectations of what it means to be a man, they contribute to the creation of certain forms of masculinity. Changing masculinities **It is important to be aware that hegemonic masculinity is changing, away from the “warrior” image, towards a more professional business masculinity. This is not to say that traditional masculinities, oriented toward physical strength, no longer exist – they certainly do – but they are losing their status as the hegemonic form of masculinity**. As Melissa T. Brown points out, the Army “has offered men several versions of masculinity: the soldier firing high-tech weapons, the professional who makes important decisions under tough conditions and saves lives, the caring surrogate father and provider of relief and protection, the bearer of marketable skills, and, of course, the guy who successfully gets into his girlfriend's bedroom”.14 Of course, masculinity is only one aspect when men or boys make their decision about whether to perform military service, mandatory or voluntary. Economic aspects should not be undervalued – military service is often a prerequisite for a career in civilian life, and leads to the connections needed for moving quickly into positions of power. Signing up voluntarily is seen in many places as the only way to get out of poverty, or to get higher education. However**,** I don't think we can afford the luxury of continuing to ignore issues of gender in our antimilitarist work. As Cynthia Enloe writes: “As we have accumulated more and more evidence from more and more societies, we have become increasingly confident in this assertion that **to omit gender from any explanation how militarization occurs, is not only to risk a flawed political analysis; it is to risk, too, a perpetually** unsuccessful campaign to roll back that militarization”.15 **A “strategy for peace must include a strategy of change in masculinities”**, writes Raewyn Connell. “This is the new dimension in peace work which studies of men suggest: **contesting the hegemony of masculinities which emphasise violence, confrontation and domination, replacing them with patterns of masculinity more open to negotiation, cooperation and equality**”.16
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